X Collection

INDEX

Page:_____

Barcode Number	Box Number	Total of Volumes	Call Number
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 497 4	15B	67	BL263.E8
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 498 6	16	41	BL604.S8-BL2780.A7
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 499 8	17	22	BM21.U4-BM487
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 500 0	18A B	33 18	BM580-BM740
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 501 2	~~19~~	~~47~~	~~BS 558.C2 BS 680~~

LC Control Number

clc96 000401

X Collection

INDEX

Page:_____

Barcode Number	Box Number	Total of Volumes	Call Number
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 490 1	7	24	B11. A51 - B3280. K8
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 491 3	8	6	BC71 - BD131
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 492 5	9	20	BF21 - BF21. F7
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 493 7	10	18	BF109. C3 - BF648. F6
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 494 9	11	19	BF901 - BF1272
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 495 0	12	28	BF1439 - BF1999. T3
	14	29	BH41 - BJ2101
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 0 020 534 496 2	15A	21	BL21. N3 - BL95

LC Control Number

clc96 000402

X Collection

FINDING-AID

Date: _____

Barcode Number	Box Number	Total of Volumes	Call Number (list each one)	Date	Condition (too brittle to serve)
	15 B	23	BL263.58	1957	
		24	"	1957	
		25	"	1958	
		26	"	1958	
		27	"	1942	
		28	"	1958	✓
		29	"	1946	
		30	"	1957	✓
		31	"	1958	✓
		32	"	1958	✓
		33	"	1958	✓
		34	"	1958	✓
		35	"	1958	✓
		36	"	1958	✓
		37	"	1958	✓
		38	"	1958	
		39	"	1946	✓
		40	"	1958	✓
		41		1958	✓
		42	"	1958	✓
		43	"	1958	✓
		44	"	1958	✓

BL 26 3E 8

X Collection

FINDING-AID

Date: _____

Barcode Number	Box Number	Total of Volumes	Call Number (list each one)	Date	Condition (too brittle to serve)
	15 B	45	BL263E8	1958	✓
		46		1958	✓
		47		1958	✓
		48		1958	✓
		49		1958	✓
		50		1958	✓
		51		1958	✓
		52		1952	✓
		53		1958	✓
		54		—	✓
		55		1952	✓
		56			✓
		57			✓
		58			✓
		59			✓
		60			✓
		61			✓
		62			✓
		63			✓
		64			✓
		65			✓
		66			✓

X Collection

FINDING-AID

Date: _____

Barcode Number	Box Number	Total of Volumes	Call Number (list each one)	Date	Condition (too brittle to serve)
	15 B	67	BL262.58	—	✓
		68		—	✓
		69		—	✓
		70		1949	✓
		71		1948	✓
		72		1947	✓
		73		1945	
		74		—	✓
		75		—	✓
		76		1948	✓
		77		—	✓
		78		—	✓
		79		—	✓
		80		1947	✓
		81		—	✓
		82		—	✓
		83		1946	✓
		84		—	✓
		85		—	✓
		86		1948	✓
		87		1948	✓
		88		1957	✓

BL263 .F8

Evolution Protest Movement

Pamphlet : ARE SCIENTISTS ALWAYS SCIENTIFIC ?

Before this question can be answered, at least two others must be asked: 1. What is Science ? 2. What is a Scientist ? Then possibly the question: 3. When is a Scientist not scientific ? can be answered.

'Science' is by dictionary definition 'Knowledge'—for which indeed the French word is still 'la science'; but this knowledge is intimate acquaintance, familiarity, at-home-ness with some 'special' subject.

A Scientist—a modern name—is, then, one who studies or practises Science.

But there are both amateur and professional scientists.

The amateur scientist may be truly scientific, though not at first academically recognised, and even later rather grudgingly, as was the accurate pioneer researcher on instinct in insects, Henri Fabre.

The professional scientist possesses modern, specialised, organised knowledge, officially or academically acknowledged.

It seems important to stress the word 'modern'—in the sense of up-to-date or latest—both because better instruments can lead to greater precision, as well as to wider knowledge; also because wider knowledge can lead to more accurate and truer interpretation of observed phenomena, especially if erroneous suppositions are thereby abandoned, and the way is opened to the acceptance of truer theory or explanation. **But scientists have often resented innovations and corrections made by fellow scientists ; in fact, nearly always.**

The reference to instruments involves the distinction between what are now called research scientists and scientists who are students of scientific theory and of the history of scientific discovery and speculation.

A very important further question may now be raised : Is a scientist a scientist all the time ? i.e. scientific in all he feels, thinks, does and says ?

Science as such should really be confined to observation, recording and formulation as distinct from explanation and interpretation. For **is a scientist necessarily scientific when he turns interpreter and philosopher ?** The answer is : Not if he is biased or blind to unpalatable facts and to God.

In the ultimate, Science is full, precise and systematised knowledge. It is probably true to say that, at last, all knowledge will be found to be interrelated; that to know anything thoroughly one would need to be omniscient, all-knowing. The great T. H. Huxley gave good advice: Know something of everything, and everything of something.

This universal or encyclopaedic knowledge is of course quite unattainable by any mortal being ; the most that scientists can do is to acquire a general knowledge before specialising—i.e. selecting (and rejecting) according to an accepted theory, in many cases. For the collector of facts is trying to prove—or to disprove—some aim or claim. It is certain he is not wandering aimlessly in an utterly uncharted wilderness; he is following some clue—and looking for others; seeking a path, an outlet, or a goal.

This goal is, of course, predetermined by his route, his route by his starting point, his starting point by his point of view. **He will thus tend to overlook or ignore what he deems—in the light of his predispositions—useless, irrelevant, unpromising, or unwelcome clues.**

All science, when it is not exclusively practical, tends to be philosophical—wandering away from or passing beyond strictly scientific preoccupations. In so far as he is also a philosopher, a scientist will be influenced by the 'climate' of opinion prevalent in his circle or in the circle of the majority of his fellow-scientists.

Until a century or so ago what might now be called **Science was called Natural Philosophy,** because it was concerned with not alone description but also with the explanation of causes immediate and ultimate, and with purposes, too.

In the last analysis, there are but two philosophies : those accepting, and those rejecting, the existence and activity of God, i.e. providence and teleology. To-day, despite persisting mystery and marvel, all is attributed to blind Chance and luck. But, since the superhuman still remains, there is some slight hope that the tide may turn again in favour of what used to be called the supernatural.

A learned man, whether **scientist or scholar,** is still in France described as a **'savant'** ; but in 18th century France **'philosophe'** was the name given to the learned man, who was also definitely agnostic or atheistical in his outlook or attitude.

X-BL263
.E8

Evolution Protest Movement

Santhia, Stoke, Hayling Island.

Pamphlet — — THE COELACANTH

The author of "OLD FOUR LEGS, THE COELACANTH" (Longmans, 21/-) which the *Listener's* reviewer calls "bombastic," making "embarrassing" reading, writes (p. 182): "A Coelacanth can do strange things to a scientist." It has certainly done so to the author. Miss Courtenay-Latimer, curator of the East London Museum of South Africa, being very interested in fishes, prevailed upon captains of the local trawlers to set aside and keep for her inspection any unusual kinds of fish they caught. On examining the catch of a trawler on December 22nd, 1938, Miss Latimer spotted "a large heavy-scaled blue fish quite unlike anything she had ever seen." The trawlerman told her that during his 30 years at sea he had not seen anything like it, and he pointed out that the fins were like arms and it looked almost like a big lizard. It was 5 feet long and weighed 127lb. She induced a reluctant taxi man to take the fish to the Museum where she made a rough sketch of it, described its features and got a photographer to take photos. Then she borrowed a hand truck and, with the aid of a native boy, took the creature to a taxidermist to prepare it for the Museum, and told him to keep all the parts he cut away in case they were important. Having no book which would help her to name the fish, Miss Latimer wrote to Mr. J. B. L. Smith, Professor of Chemistry at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, sending the sketch of the fish and her description and asked him to identify it. Smith was a keen angler and had a local reputation as an authority on fishes.

The fish in question was a Coelacanth, a species of Crossopterygian fringe-finned ganoid which lived between the Upper Devonian and Upper Cretaceous periods, and has left numerous fossils. The group is made up of 7 families, of which all but one, the Polypteridae, are believed to have died out. To-day the only surviving genera of the family are *Polypterus* and *Calamoichthys*, which live in the rivers of tropical Africa. The only fossils of this family that have been found are scales from Eocene deposits of Egypt, that is, about 50 million years ago, as fossils are now dated. Miss Latimer's fish belongs to another family, the Coelacanthidae, of which the latest-known fossils are about 60 million years old. Thus her fish shows that another family of fringe-finned ganoids, that is supposed to have died out about 60 million years ago, has living descendants. Such discoveries are rare but have been made, as in the case of the Port Jackson shark. This being so, Smith would have congratulated Miss Latimer on her find, told her he believed it to be a Coelacanth—a member of a family believed to have long been extinct, and advised her to send a report with her sketches and photograph to a Scientific Journal. Unfortunately Professor Smith, being a fisherman rather than an Icthyologist, seems to have been unaware of such facts, and being, on his own admission, exceedingly impressionable, acted strangely. He was absent from Grahamstown when the letter arrived and did not read it till January 3rd. On doing this he exercised his imagination freely. He writes (p. 27): "A bomb seemed to burst in my brain, and beyond that sketch and the paper of the letter I was looking at a series of fishy creatures

X-BL263
.E?

THE PHENOMENA OF MAKING INEXPLICABLE BY THE 'EVOLUTION-MECHANISM.'

By

E. JOHANNSEN

". . . I remember well the time when the thought of the eye made me cold all over, but I have got over this stage of the complaint, and now small trifling particulars of structure often make me very uncomfortable. The sight of the feather in a peacock's tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me sick . . .'

Charles Darwin, in a letter to A. Gray.

One hundred years after Darwin, all we need to make us 'sick' at the selection-theory is the thought of the nest of an Indian weaver bird, or that of a tailor bird built as an enclosure of leaves tied together by the bird—or the nest of the oriole suspended like a hammock from the fork of a branch, —or, again, a mere nest looking like a vase lying on its side. Such was shown me some time ago with the whispered remark: 'How could this have been possible by natural selection?'

The nest of an Indian weaver bird is a beautifully plaited structure, in shape like a chemist's retort—the entrance being from below through the tube of the 'retort'. It hangs from one of the lower branches of a tree, and is composed of thin strips torn from blades of long elephant grass. Douglas Dewar, who long ago wrote a paper on 'The Nesting Habits of the Baya' (*Journal of the Bombay Nat. Hist. Society*, 1909), tells us how it is built.

'Having selected a branch from which to suspend the nest, the bird flies to a clump of such grass, alights on one of the upright blades and makes with its beak a notch low down in a neighbouring blade, grips the edge of this above the notch, pulls or rather jerks its beak away and strips off a thin strand of the blade. Holding this in its beak it strips off a second and third strip and flies off with these. The bird then twines these one by one round the branch from which the nest will hang. Owing to the silicon in the grass the latter does not slip when twisted round anything. The fibres next collected are plaited into those attached to the branch until a rope about 4 inches long has been plaited. This is then expanded by the addition of further material into a bell-shape structure, which will form the roof of the nest. The next step is to plait a loop across the base of the bell which now has the appearance of an inverted basket with a handle. When the loop is completed the hen collects no more material but remains perched on the loop and helps the cock to plait in the material—she working from the perch, and he from the outside of the nest. The next step is to close up one side of the loop to form a receptacle for the eggs. The other side is left open, but is prolonged downwards to form a tubular passage about 6 inches long and 2 in diameter. Thus the entrance to the nest is from below.'

1. What has the Evolution-Theory to offer as Antecedent Stages for this Type of Nest? (and of course for any kind of Construction made not only by Birds, but Spiders, Ants, etc.).

According to the evolution-theory, birds evolved from reptiles, which laid their eggs on the bare ground; so the earliest birds must have done likewise. It is no good a selectionist answering: "Evolution of nest? It happens somehow, but we do not exactly know how!" For the evolution-

X-BL263
.E8

EVOLUTIONISTS OPPOSED TO EVOLUTION

"EVOLUTION" is a theory having little factual support which has become a creed unjustified by logic or experience.

Scientists as a body started specialising early, thus abandoning that discipline which the study of language and literature gives. The very word "evolution" is used in some half dozen senses, and the authors of *The Meaning of Meaning,* dealing with little other than the meanings of Meaning and Beauty, most unfortunately dealt neither with the meaning of Science in general nor of Evolution in particular. But they did provide a discipline and method that can be satisfactorily and helpfully applied to this vital matter.

If we look into the poke which contains and conceals these six senses, we shall discover :

1. The development of bud into flower, or of egg into bird, etc. ; but this is not Evolution ; let us keep to its true name of Development ;
2. The selective breeding by which geneticists obtain special varieties of wheat or pea, rose or tulip, pigeon or dog, horse or cattle ; but this is not Evolution ; let us keep to its true name of Selective Breeding ;
3. The progressive improvement in the history of inventions : in car and plane, even in fountain pen and tooth paste tube ; but this is not Evolution ; let us keep to its true name of Invention ;
4. There is the degenerate change brought about by loss of some genetic factor, or by congenital disease transmitted by a parent to a child ; let us call it Degeneration ;
5. There is the supposition of some people that God used some sort of Evolution as His method of Creation ; but this is an unwarrantable assumption on the part of creationists of sorts, and certainly would not be acceptable to any real evolutionists ; so let us call it by its true name of Supposition, rather than Divine Transformism ;
6. Finally, there is the real "pig in the poke" or, since we are letting it out, the "cat in the bag." This is a fanciful "self-starting and self-improving process," and this is what Evolution is actually meant to be, however.

Development, Selective Breeding, Invention, and even Degeneration, are all facts, obvious and to be accepted, but with them, and under the

X-BL263
.E8

Dr. Heribert Nilsson's Views on The Theory of Evolution

It is frequently asserted that no scientist of first-rate ability questions the evolution theory. The publication early in 1954 of a book by a leading biologist who rejects the theory is, therefore, of no small importance.

In *Synthetische Artbildung* (Synthetic Speciation) Dr. Heribert Nilsson, Professor of Botany at the University of Lund, Sweden, has set down the result of his life's studies in genetics and other subjects which bear on the origin of species. The book is in German, but its 1,300 pages include a 100-page synopsis in English.

In the first part Dr. Nilsson considers the evidence of genetics, and concludes that evolution is not going on at the present time. In the second part he shows that the fossils do not indicate a continuous evolution in the past, but rather a series of revolutions in which one flora or fauna was suddenly replaced by another. He considers that periodic world-wide catastrophes not only destroyed one set of living creatures, but also provided the seeds of the next. He does not believe that fully grown plants and animals appeared suddenly, but that unicellular gametes were formed from an aggregation of the chemical genes, and that these grew into adult organisms, just as new organisms today come into being from unicellular gametes which contain all the genes necessary to control their development.

This pamphlet is not a synopsis of the book : it is designed to provide English speaking students with some original statements on genetics and palæo-botany by Dr. Nilsson which bear on the evolution theory. Quotations from pages 1-1140 have been translated from the German by W. E. Filmer.

Synthetische Artbildung is published by C. W. K. Gleerup Publishers, Lund, Sweden ; price, paper-covered, 225 Swedish Crowns, cloth, 250 Swedish Crowns.

Copies of this pamphlet are obtainable at 3d. each or 2/- per dozen, post paid, from the Hon. Secretaries of the

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

W. E. FILMER, F.Z.S., 23 Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey.

DR. D. S. MILNE, 47 Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.

J. BYRT, B.Sc., "Elpis," Wilson Street, Cheltenham, S. 22, Victoria, Australia.

TWO BANNED BROADCASTS AGAINST EVOLUTION

BL263
E8

1. IS THE EVOLUTION THEORY SCIENTIFIC ?

IT is commonly believed that science has proved that we come from monkeys. Most scientists, however, would be horrified at such a crude statement—they would prefer to say that man and the apes had a common ancestor. But if you were to ask to see a fossil of this ancestor, you would learn that it has not yet been found ; it is still hypothetical!

Science has been defined as a system of knowledge arrived at by the " scientific method." This comprises first the observation of facts, such as the similarity between different kinds of animals and secondly in making hypotheses to account for them, such as the evolution theory which supposes that similar animals are descended from common ancestors. The third stage in the scientific method is to make logical deductions from the theory and finally to test them by performing experiments or making observations which would verify or disprove the theory. In the case of the evolution theory, which supposes that one kind of animal descended from another, it should be possible to show experimentally how this can happen, but no such transformation has been achieved. In the case of men and monkeys we conclude that there should be fossils of their common ancestors, but so far no such fossil has been brought to light. In consequence many people doubt the theory of evolution, because no experiment has been devised which can prove it to be true.

Inconceivable Transformations

Not only this, but the theory supposes that a number of transformations have taken place which appear to be inconceivable. For example, whales are said to have evolved from four-legged land animals. Now in order that an animal may stand and walk, its hind legs must articulate on a pelvis, or hip-bone, which is firmly fixed to the back-bone. A whale, on the other hand, has no hind legs, but swims with an up and down motion of its great tail, motivated by large muscles above and below the back-bone. The muscles below the back-bone have to pass directly through that space occupied by the pelvis of a land animal. Consequently before these muscles could begin to evolve, the pelvis would have to be scrapped or detached from the back-bone. In either case the creature would be unable to walk long before it had developed the muscles that enable it to swim. No plausible explanation has ever been given as to how this transformation occurred, nor is there a single fossil to throw light on the subject. Seals and sea-lions can give no clue, because in these creatures the hind legs and pelvis are strongly developed.

Feathers are another example. You may read in text-books that the scales of certain reptiles got frayed out through their jumping about in trees, and in the course of time they turned into feathers. But if you were to examine a feather under a

X-BL263
.E8

THE FIRST ANIMALS

A FILMSTRIP LECTURE ON EVOLUTION

prepared by

W. E. FILMER, F.Z.S.

An Exposure of the School Broadcasts entitled "How Things Began"

PRICE 4d.

Post free prices:

SCRIPT: 5d. each, 3/- per dozen, £1 per 100.

FILMSTRIP (56 frames): 15/- each.

Obtainable from:

W. E. FILMER, 23 Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey.

Dr. D. S. MILNE, 47 Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.

J. BYRT, 15 Repton Road, East Malvern, S.E. 5, Victoria, Australia.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

1952

X-BL263
.F8

EVOLUTION AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES

IT is unusual to find Christians agreeing with atheists on matters concerning the Christian faith, but a leading article in *The English Churchman* (2/11/51) recently quoted with evident approval the pronouncement of *The Freethinker* (30/9/51) that "Evolution and Christianity are deadly enemies." According to *The Freethinker* it is only "modernists and half believers and indifferent Christians" who readily subscribe to the theory of evolution.

The anti-Christian origin of the evolution theory is not generally realised. The materialist philosopher Herbert Spencer had already planned his series of works based on evolution, and enlisted the services of T. H. Huxley and others, before Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared.[1] Huxley's subsequent enthusiastic support of Darwin is thus explained, and it was he and not Darwin who first said in 1859 that it was an "indubitable fact" that the human embryo passed through sundry animal stages in the course of its development.[2] The non-factual character of this statement may be judged from the fact that the early stages of the human embryo had never been observed until many years later.

Immediately after its publication the *Origin of Species* was condemned by the Cambridge geologist, Adam Sedgwick, as "a dish of rank materialism cleverly cooked and served up merely to make us independent of a Creator."[3] After a study of Darwin's religious life, the American theologian B. B. Warfield was "regretfully forced to recognise in his (Darwin's) whole course of argument a desire to eliminate the proofs of God's activity in the world,"[4] while Dr. R. E. D. Clark has more recently shown in *Darwin : Before and After* (1948) that "his life was one long attempt to escape from Paley, to escape from the Church, to escape from God."[5]

It has always been recognised that the theory of evolution is incompatible with the historicity of the early chapters of Genesis. There are, nevertheless, a few well meaning apologists who can twist the Scriptures to make them mean anything, and others who so confuse myth and history that it is impossible for them to know what really happened. But it cannot be denied that whereas the Bible says that "God formed man of the dust of the ground" (dead matter), evolutionists say he was derived from living creatures ; the Bible speaks of a specially created first man whose existence evolutionists deny.

Until they accepted the evolution theory, the Christian Churches had always regarded the Bible as the Word of God, and therefore in the original without error. From the late eighteenth century, however, a school of Higher Critics has been developing a theory based on the assumption that miracles in general and prophecy in particular had never occurred, and that most of the Old Testament was, in fact, a pious fraud perpetrated by Jewish priests in the time of Ezra. This theory gained much support from the assertions of evolutionists that serious factual errors existed in the Bible account of creation.

THE INTOLERANCE OF THE B.B.C.

X-BL263
.E8

During the past twenty years the Evolution Protest Movement has made repeated attempts to induce the BBC to publish a talk criticising the theory of evolution on scientific grounds.

Early in 1936 the BBC agreed to consider a talk to this effect of 1,000 words. This was sent to the BBC, but after considering it for about six weeks, the Director of Talks returned the script with the remark, " We are of opinion that the arguments in it are not of such a character as to constitute a basis on which such a debate could be arranged with a scientist who accepts the theory of evolution."

Obviously no one could be found to meet successfully the arguments in it. This rejected talk, with comments, was reproduced as a small pamphlet entitled " Concealing the Truth."[1]

Several adherents of the E.P.M. wrote to the BBC asking why no talk criticising evolution was permitted by that body. In his reply to one of these letters the Director of the Secretariat said that the BBC held no opinion against the theory of evolution, and was " quite prepared to consider for broadcasting a positive expression of opinion by a scientist of repute " who wished to speak " from a Christian standpoint."

The E.P.M. asked Lt.-Col. L. M. Davies, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S., to take up this offer. Whereupon Davies wrote to the Director of the Secretariat asking if he was considered to be " a scientist of repute." In reply the Director admitted that he was and asked him for a broadcast for which he would allow a few minutes. On receipt of Davies' script the BBC told Davies that they proposed to send the script to Professor A. E. Trueman for " expert opinion." Davies agreed but said that as Trueman was an opponent, he should be asked to criticise only the facts adduced by Davies and not his opinions. On June 18th, 1945, the BBC told Davies that his talk had been rejected because, although Trueman did not dispute the facts adduced by Davies, he thought that Davies' " use " of these facts would " mislead " the public and " confuse " them as to the " actual state of affairs." Davies' rejected script is embodied, with extracts from the correspondence, in the pamphlets " Evolutionary Fables and Geological Facts "[2] and " How the BBC Humbugs the Public."[2]

After the publication of the above facts comments were made in religious periodicals, and on August 4th, 1952, under the headline " B.B.C. Has Abused Monopoly :—Free Church Magazine's Declaration," *The Scotsman* reported :

" Criticism of the B.B.C. for ' an abuse of its monopoly calculated to undermine free speech in this country,' in presenting the subject of evolution, is made in the current issue of the *Monthly Record* of the Free Church of Scotland.

" The writer claims that all requests by representative societies for a fair statement of the Christian position on evolution have been consistently ignored by the B.B.C. This, he declares, ' is an abuse that inevitably saps the spiritual strength and Christian character of the

[1]A few copies are available at 2d. each.
[2]Available at 3d. each post free.

.E8

The "Science" of Dr. Julian Huxley

By Lt.-Col. L. M. Davies, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.

IN its issue for August 17, 1951, THE ENGLISH CHURCHMAN published a broadcast which the B.B.C. had asked me to prepare as "a scientist of repute", but refused to let me give when they saw how the geological facts which I quoted opposed the idea that evolution is proved. Yet their own critic admitted the "substantial accuracy" of all that I said.

This shows the value of the B.B.C.'s pretensions to let "both sides be heard on all disputed questions", and never to let mere hypotheses be broadcast as proved facts. Their practice is the reverse of these pretensions.

The latest example of their pandering to fiction masquerading as science appears in the six long broadcast talks on evolution which they allowed Dr. Julian S. Huxley to give. See *The Listener* (Vol. XLVI) for October 18 to November 22, 1951, inclusive. (In the following references to these, roman numerals refer to the talks concerned, followed by the page numbers in question.)

Avowed Atheist

These broadcasts are vitiated, throughout, by the fact that Dr. Huxley is an ardent atheist. Although his own grandfather, T. H. Huxley, said that "only a very great fool" would deny the possible existence of God (*Evolution and Ethics and Other Essays*, p. 140), Dr. Julian Huxley declares: "I disbelieve in a personal god . . . in the existence of Heaven or Hell . . . the Last Judgment", etc. See his *Religion Without Revelation*, 1940, p. 7. In the preface (pp. vi.-vii) to that book, while admitting that some scientists believe in God, he says that "God . . . is fast tending to fade away, like the Cheshire cat in *Alice*, until only a faint cosmic smile remains", and man should now regard himself as "the highest entity of which he has any knowledge". Huxley urges "that any religion which lays primary emphasis on salvation in the next world will be something of an obstacle towards getting the best out of this world", and we must "rid ourselves of this doctrine of a Divine Power external to ourselves".

So there is his bias, openly avowed—and his grandfather's opinion of it. What is more, as J. L. Russell has well said, Dr. Julian Huxley "appears to suffer, even more acutely than most popular scientists, from an inability to distinguish facts which have already been discovered from facts which he hopes will be discovered" (*Scrutiny*, Vol. III, Dec., 1934, p. 277). That inability appears throughout Dr. Huxley's six broadcasts, in which he repeatedly represents his *deductions from* the theory of evolution as *facts establishing* that theory. The actual facts are very different.

Above all things, Dr. Huxley—as an atheist—dreads evidence of DESIGN in nature. To him, any such evidence is a "bogey" (I. 659), and he tries at all costs to convince his hearers that it does not really exist (I. 628; II. 678-9, 707; etc.). But

X-BL263
.E8

CREATION or EVOLUTION

by D. S. MILNE

X-BL263
.E8

THE FLUORINE METHOD OF DATING FOSSILS

IT has long been known that bone will absorb fluorine which is brought into contact with it. At a meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1947, it was suggested that the percentage of fluorine in a fossilised bone might indicate its age. Accordingly Dr. Kenneth Oakley of the British Museum and Dr. Randall Hoskins, a government chemist, published in *Nature* (11 March, 1950) the results of the fluorine analysis of three fossils of ancient man, namely the Piltdown, Galley Hill and Swanscombe fossils. They chose these because they are skeletons in the evolutionists' cupboard, being examples of man of modern type who lived at about the same time as the ape-men who are supposed to be our ancestors.

The reliability of the fluorine method of dating fossils may be judged from the obvious fact that the rate at which fluorine is absorbed will depend largely on the amount of that element in the surrounding moisture, and that the amount of fluorine in drinking water is known to vary from nil to as much as 13.7 milligrammes per litre. Even in one particular spot, there is no certainty that the fluorine content of the local water will remain constant over long periods, for in the course of hundreds of thousands of years the source of the water may change several times.

Another serious source of error is the presence of other chemicals in the water or soil which may inhibit the absorption of fluorine. Thus among the fossils collected from the Piltdown gravel were two hippopotamus teeth. According to the analysis published by Drs. Oakley and Hoskins, one of these contained 0.1% and the other 1.1% fluorine, that is eleven times as much, although both teeth are supposed to be about the same age. They explain this enormous discrepancy by saying that the "hydroxy apatite prisms in the dentine became coated by iron sulphide which inhibited fluorine absorption" in the tooth which had the lower fluorine content. If errors of this magnitude have to be admitted, the validity of all the results is open to very serious criticism.

Yet a third source of error may arise from the variable fluorine content of the live bone from which the fossil was formed. Figures published by the Medical Research Council in "*Industrial Fluorosis*" show that nomally the bones of sheep contain from 0.01 to 0.05% fluorine, but in sheep suffering from fluorosis the fluorine content may be anything from 0.2 to 1.2%. Thus in such a sheep the fluorine content of the bone is already as high in the living sheep as it might be in a fossil half a million years old. Not only this, but according to the published figures, the fluorine content may be quite considerably different in different bones of the same animal.

In view of all these sources of error, any one of which might completely obscure the true age of a fossil, it is surprising that anyone would waste time analysing fossils to find their fluorine content. When we

X-BL263
.E8

EVOLUTION & MORALS

by

W. E. FILMER, B.A.

Reprinted from "*The Head Teachers Review*," October, 1948

Obtainable at 2d. each, 1s. per doz. or 100 for 6s. from:

W. E. Filmer, 23 Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey,
Dr. D. S. Milne 47 Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.
J. McKellar, 6 Ormsby Grove, Toorak, Melbourne, Australia.
F. Grim, 25 Oak Avenue, Kempton Park, S. Africa.
Dr. J. D. Bales, 707 East Race Street, Searcy, Arkansas, U.S.A.

#59

THE BIBLE AND EVOLUTION

By

Lt.-Col. L. M. DAVIES, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.

(Reproduced with additions from three articles heoded "The Bible To-day," which appeored in "The Girl Crusader," Vol. 9, Nos. 2, 3 and 4, for 1946.)

1
FOREWORD

WHEN addressing the Seven churches, our Lord said to the only one for whom He had no reproach :

" Because thou hast kept the Word of My patience, I also will keep thee from the[1] hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dweii upon the earth " —(Rev. iii. 10).

So there is to be a special time of world-wide temptation ; and other prophecies indicate that it will come at the end of our age. We may therefore note that recent developments seem to be making such a thing possible ; for national isolations are everywhere breaking down, while the radio carries ideas instantaneously all over the world. If there is to be universal temptation, it might well come now. And what do we see ?—churches emptying, and lawlessness everywhere on the increase. Is *this*, then, the hour of which our Lord spoke ? It would seem so ; for Scripture describes the form which the temptation is to take, and what we call " modern thought " takes that form—and is certainly becoming world-wide in its extent.

But some people will resist the temptation; and our Lord indicates that they will be those who refuse to abandon His Word. So the following notes try to show how the Bible meets the present crisis. And when we see how those who reject Scripture use the very arguments foretold of them, it certainly takes the sting out of their attacks. What is more, by reviving the tactics used in Eden, these sceptics show that, when all mankind is concerned at the close of " man's day " (1 Cor. iv. 3 ; margin), temptation takes the same form as it took with Eve—the mother of all men —at the beginning of that day. So modern scoffers not only fulfil Bible prophecies, but also vindicate Gen. iii. 1-5 as depicting the most fatal temptation of our race. Rejecting Scripture bonds, they justify the derision of Scripture's Author (Ps. ii. 4).[2]

[1] Note the definite article, which shows that this temptation had been mentioned before.

[2] This psalm refers to our times ; for only late in the Christian age could gentiles (Heb. *goyim*, translated " heathen " in verse 1), talk of casting off Jehovah's and Christ's bonds, which they never accepted before that age.

Obtainable from :

W. E. FILMER, 23 Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey.
Dr. D. S. MILNE, 47 Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.
J. McKELLAR, 6 Ormsby Grove, Toorak, Melbourne, Australia.

Post free prices : Single copies 3d., 2s. per dozen.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

X-BL263
.E8

An Atheist Kicks Against the Pricks

Mr. John Bowden is an Australian atheist. He spends a great deal of time attacking Christianity, both in writing and in public debate. In this capacity he takes strong exception to the Evolution Protest Movement, for, like all atheists, he believes in evolution.

He has recently sent to Douglas Dewar the typescript of three books which he hopes to get published after revision, and on which he asked Mr. Dewar to comment. The first is an attack on Dr. R. E. D. Clark's *Darwin: Before and After*, the second an attack on Dewar's *More Difficulties of the Evolution Theory* and the third consists of comments on Dewar's debates with H. S. Shelton and J. B. S. Haldane.

The fact that Mr. Bowden has found it necessary to write a manuscript of some 100,000 words on these debates would seem to indicate that he considers Shelton and Haldane have fared so ill that they are in urgent need of his support. It is evident, however, that his main concern is to propagate atheism, for the latter half of the book degenerates into a general tirade against Christians, the Bible and any idea of God.

One of his main arguments is that Dewar and others who reject the evolution theory do so because of their religion which makes it impossible for them to view the evidence for evolution impartially. " His opposition to the theory, therefore, is *primarily religious*," he says, " the scientific ' reasons ' he gives for his rejection of evolution are secondary—that is, they are so many rationalisations."

Now it is a well known fact that a great many people, including the Archbishop of Canterbury, who are called Christians, do accept the evolution theory, and this fact provides clear evidence that these people have not been prejudiced by the religion. Can Mr. Bowden name a single atheist who accepts the theory of creation ? If not, surely this proves that atheists in general and Mr. Bowden in particular are unable to take an impartial view of the scientific facts bearing on the question of evolution or creation.

So far as Mr. Dewar is concerned, those who know him are aware that he started writing against evolution some 25 years before the E.P.M. was formed, and that he did so not from any religious motive, but purely in the interests of science and truth. Mr. Bowden's manuscript, on the other hand, shows as well as anything could, that he has put up an impenetrable mental shutter against every argument against evolution which Dewar put forward in these debates.

X-BL263
.E8

WHY I REJECT THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION

by a Member of the Victoria Institute

Copies of this pamphlet are obtainable at 6d. per copy, or 4/6 per doz. p.f., from the Hon. Secretaries of the Evolution Protest Movement :—

W. E. FILMER, 23, Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey.
Dr. D. S. MILNE, 47, Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.
J. McKELLAR, 6, Ormsby Grove, Toorak, Melbourne, Australia.
F. GRIM, 25, Oak Avenue, Kempton Park, South Africa.

THE EVOLUTION THEORY IN ITS RELATION TO TOOTH REPLACEMENT.

By

F. GORDON CAWSTON, M.A., M.D. (Cantab), F.Z.S.

(with an introduction by Douglas Dewar.)

Copies of this pamphlet are obtainable at 3d. per copy ; 2/3 per dozen, post free, from the Honorary Secretaries of the Evolution Protest Movement :—

W. E. Filmer, 23, Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey, England ;
D. D. S. Milne, 47, Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand ;
John McKellar, 6, Ormsby Grove, Toorak, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT.

X-BL263
.E8

TEACHING EVOLUTION IN SCHOOLS

The attention of all education authorities is drawn to the following extract from a letter dated 26th June 1947 from the Ministry of Education.

"I entirely agree with the view that the theory of Evolution should be taught only as a theory, and that the difficulties in the way of its acceptance should be unfolded just as definitely as the arguments in its favour. I agree, also, that the subject is quite inappropriate for young children, and should be dealt with only when a boy or girl has considerable experience in the facts of Biology."

Yours faithfully,
(signed) M. P. ROSEVEARE
SENIOR CHIEF INSPECTOR.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

64
X-BL263
.E8

BIOLOGICAL FACTS AND FANCIES.

BIOLOGY. AN INTRODUCTION TO MEDICAL AND OTHER STUDIES, by Dr. F. D. F. Murray, Professor of Zoology at the University of Sydney. Published in 1950 by Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London.

THIS book would be valuable for the amount of biological information it contains, were it not ruined by the blight of transformism. The author, like so many other biologists, has been hypnotised by Darwin into accepting the evolution myth. He has donned what may be called Darwinian blinkers, which have the peculiarity that they prevent the wearer from seeing any phenomena that give the lie to the doctrine of evolution. In consequence this book is simply an exposition of evolutionism, citing only facts that are not against that doctrine, and ignoring or distorting all that are opposed to it. This is not all. Not content with withholding all awkward facts from his readers and singing the praises of evolutionism, he indulges in sneers at creationism and, by way of discrediting this, he sometimes sets up an Aunt Sally, which he promptly knocks over, in the belief that he has thereby knocked out creationism.

Murray, in his introduction, expresses fear that his readers may conclude from some of his expressions that he ascribes " purposiveness to any part of the evolutionary process." To him teleology is a bogey, but he points out that phrases tinged with teleology are convenient and the reader when he comes across them should realise that they are not intended to denote purposiveness.

The worst chapters in the book are Nos. XXIII and XXIV in which Murray sets forth his beliefs regarding the origin of man. He accepts the out-of-date theories of Elliot Smith and perpetrates the following (p. 306): " Man, then, is a big-brained ape-like terrestial primate whose arboreal origin preserved his hand, improved his sight, degraded his sense of smell, altered his face, set him on the way of upright gait and sharpened his intelligence." What a lot man's " arboreal origin " has accomplished !

Murray asserts (p. 452) " There is no evidence in favour of creation." Having made this pontifical pronouncement he writes: " The study of animals and plants presents us with a body of facts, and for the interpretation of these the two theories of creation and evolution are offered. If evolution is accepted, the facts fall into their place, reasonably, as parts of a connected whole, telling a story that the mind accepts, but if special creation be accepted, the facts are meaningless, mere puzzles with no rational answer."

In the above short passage there are two rather serious omissions, viz., the words " telling a story that the mind accepts " should read " a story acceptable to the mind of one who loves fairy stories and fables," and after the word " fact " in each place should be added " when distorted by certain evolutionists."

According to Murray the evidence for evolution can be classified under the following headings: 1, evidence from fossils; 2, from comparative anatomy and embryology; 3, from the geographical distribution of animals; 4, from " systematics "; 5, from domesticated animals and plants, and 6, from immunology. Note that nothing is said about the evidence of geneticists. This happens to be so unfavourable that Genetics are barred in Russia and have been dropped by French biologists as little better than waste of time.

1. EVIDENCE FROM FOSSILS.

Prof. Murray's account of the fossil evidence is most misleading. " It is," he writes, " believed that the first living beings originated some time in the Archæozoic, and in the Proterozoic are found fossil worms. In the Palæozoic are other invertebrate animals but at first no vertebrates."

X-BL2
.E8

The B.B.C. Abuses its Monopoly.

BY

LT.-COL. L. MERSON DAVIES,
M.A., Ph.D., D.Sc., F.G.S., F.R.S.E,

AND

DOUGLAS DEWAR, B.A., F.Z.S.

BRITISH BIBLE UNION:
Publishing Dept.:—"Berkeley," Carew Road, Eastbourne.
London Offices:—7, Ludgate Broadway, E.C. 4.
4th Edition
1947

Price 2d. plus 1d. postage; 1/3 per dozen post free; 50 and upwards at 1d. each post free. Obtainable from the above addresses, or from The Evolution Protest Movement, W. E. Filmer, 78 ~~North End, Croydon, Surrey~~.

X-BL263
.E8

THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF NEW ZEALAND REFUSES TO DEBATE EVOLUTION

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

X-BL263
.E8

PERNICIOUS PROPAGANDA

BY THE

B.B.C.

A PROTEST.

For years, despite the protests of the Evolution Protest Movement, the B.B.C. has sedulously propagated the doctrine of Organic Evolution and refused to broadcast a talk dealing with the scientific objections to the doctrine. On June 21st, 1939, it broadcast a talk by Professor Munro Fox which occupied twenty minutes and which must come very near to establishing a record for the greatest number of controversial assertions uttered in so short a period of time. The talk was to schools, one of the series "Biology in the Service of Man"; its title was "Evolution; Man's Origin."

Knowing Prof. H. Munro Fox, F.R.S., to be a fervid evolutionist, and having previously caught him making mis-statements, I took notes of his talk, which I reproduce below.

Gist of Talk.

We have evolved from other animals just as horses and asses have (1); Our ancestor became man about one million years ago (2); There are fossils over 400 million years old (reference made to a diagram in a book before the listener) and living creatures have probably existed on the earth twice that time (3); What animals are related to us just as horses are related to zebras and asses? Our nearest relatives are the ape, chimpanzee and gorilla (4); These have not our brain and are not erect, but are built like us and have the same bones with differences. The chief differences are man is cleverer, can talk and eat meat which they do not (5); It is quite certain that the great apes are as much like us in body as horses are like zebras (6); Scientists say that we and the apes have the same ancestors. They know it because some of the fossil ancestors of both man and ape have been found (7); Mammals have evolved from the reptiles. The first mammals were something like the shrews of to-day (8); The London clay is the beginning of the age of mammals. Some shrews evolved into Lemurs (9);

X-BL263
.E8

EMBRYOLOGY AND EVOLUTION

BY

L. MERSON DAVIES, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.

Reprinted by kind permission of the Editor, 'The National Message'

☆ ☆ ☆

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

Price 3d. each. 2s. per doz.

X-BL263
.E8

Evolution: The Tactics of the Science Masters Association. (SECOND EDITION 1946)

The pamphlet "Evolution. How the Doctrine is propagated in our Schools" (price 5d.) sets forth the unscientific way in which Biology is being taught in the Schools of this country, and the correspondence on this matter between the Evolution Protest Movement and the Board of Education. The Board, through its spokesman, Mr. E. G. Savage, deplored "lapses from the scientific spirit" whether in the text-book or the class-room, but was not prepared to interfere and suggested that the E. P. M. should take up the matter with the Science Masters Association. The E. P. M. acted on this suggestion and the following correspondence has since taken place between it and the Science Masters Association:

Letter of 11.3.1938 from the Chairman of the Evolution Protest Movement to The Hon. Sec. of the Science Masters Association.

I have been requested by the Executive Committee of the Evolution Protest Movement to inform your Association that the adherents of the above Movement are very dissatisfied with the biological text-books used in schools, and, in consequence, with the way in which biology is being taught.

The Movement has set forth some of the reasons for its dissatisfaction in correspondence with the Board of Education; the most important part of this correspondence is set forth in the pamphlet "Evolution. How the Doctrine is propagated in our Schools," of which I send herewith three copies.

I beg leave to invite particular attention to the Recommendations of the Evolution Protest Movement, set forth on page 10 of the pamphlet and to the subsequent letter of Mr. E. G. Savage, Senior Chief Inspec or of the Board

It will be seen that (1) Mr. Savage, while deploring lapses from the scientific spirit, whether in the text book or class room and agreeing that lapses occur in text books, does not think they occur in the class room (2) The Board of Education leaves details of the curriculum to Local Authorities and is not prepared to issue the pamphlet suggested by our Movement. (3) Mr. Savage suggests that the matter be pursued with your Association.

As regards the teachers, our Movement does not suggest that any of these consciously takes up an unfair attitude. Our contention is that it is unreasonable to expect the teacher to be superior to those from whom he derives his knowledge. The pros and cons of the theory of organic evolution were not fairly set before the teacher when he was learning biology at school and university. That this was so at school is demonstrated by the extracts from school books set out in the above-mentioned pamphlet. As regards instruction at University, the following will show that this was equally unsatisfactory. The late Sir J. Arthur Thomson, Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen, 1899-1930, writes "Biology for Everyman," (1934), p. 7): "Whatever we think about living creatures, we must include in our thought the fact that all have evolved from very simple forms of life. Flowering plants evolved from flowerless plants, and backboned animals from backboneless animals, and many-celled creatures from one-celled

X-BL263
.E8

RATIONALISTS IN RETREAT

by

W. E. FILMER, B.A.

Post free prices : Single copies 3d., 2s. per dozen.

Obtainable from :

W. E. FILMER, 23 Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey.
Dr. D. S. MILNE, 47 Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.
J. McKELLAR, 6 Ormsby Grove, Toorak, Melbourne, Australia.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT
1948

X-BL263
.E8

EVOLUTIONARY FABLES AND GEOLOGICAL FACTS

By Lt. Col. L. M. DAVIES,
D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.

Reprinted from "*The Indian Christian*," Vol. 36, No. 6,
March, 1946

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT, 1947
REPRINTED 1949

Obtainable from W. E. Filmer, 23 Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey

#72 X-BL263
.E8

EVOLUTION — THE MODERN SUPERSTITION

by

JOHN McKELLAR

(Reproduced from "The Night is Far Spent")

Price 3d. per copy: 1/6 per dozen post free.

Obtainable from:
W. E. FILMER, Hon. Sec., E.P.M., 23, Dingwall Road, Croydon, Surrey.
Dr. D. S. MILNE, Hon. Sec., E.P.M., 47, Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, N.Z.
JOHN McKELLAR, 6, Ormsby Grove, Toorak, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT
1947

#73 X-BL263
.E8

OBSESSIONS OF BIOLOGISTS

By

DOUGLAS DEWAR
B.A., F.Z.S., Barrister-at-Law

and

Lt.-COL. L. M. DAVIES
D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.

A Reprint, by kind permission of Messrs. Constable and Co. Ltd., of the articles "Obsessions of Biologists" and "More Obsessions of Biologists" from the issues of "The Nineteenth Century and After" of July, 1944, and February, 1945.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

#174 X-BL263 E8

DO VESTIGIAL ORGANS EXIST?

By

DOUGLAS DEWAR, F.Z.S.

Prof. J. Ritchie of Edinburgh University says, "there are many vestigial organs in animals, especially in the higher animals, which remain very slightly developed, and which often disappear without having served any apparent purpose. Such are the gill-slits or visceral clefts in Reptiles, Birds and Mammals, the teeth of young whalebone whales, the pineal body (a rudimentary eye) in Vertebrates. Only on the theory that they are vestiges of structures which were of use in ancestors are these rudiments intelligible. They are relics of past history, comparable, as Darwin said, to the unpronounced letters in many words."[1]

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Before considering the alleged vestigial organs cited by Dr. Ritchie general considerations indicate that such rudimentary organs as do exist are far more intelligible on the theory of creation than on that of evolution.

Nascent Organs. If vestigial organs exist which are the degenerate remains of organs possessed and used by some remote ancestor, then this would be evidence of devolution and not of evolution. The whole essence of the theory of organic evolution is that animals have organs which their ancestors did not possess, and consequently these organs must at one time have existed in a nascent condition. It is significant that no such nascent organs are known, either in animals living to-day, or in the fossils of any extinct animal. Thus the vestigial organs cited by the evolutionist provide evidence for the destructive process of degeneration and none for any constructive process of evolution. No evolutionist who had any understanding of the rules of evidence would dream of citing vestigial structures; he would find them very inconvenient and deny their existence.

The Laws of Embryonic Development. The law of phyletic isoschematism put forward by Vialleton in 1924 states that the embryonic primordia have initially the same constitution and form in all animals of the same great group. Thus every embryo has the rudiments of all the organs that occur in any member of its group, even of those which do not develop in some species or individuals. For example, every mammal embryo has the primordia of both male and female organs, but normally only the organs of one sex matures in each individual while those of the other sex remain rudimentary. Thus men have rudimentary mammae which are never of any use, but this does not mean that our male ancestors suckled their young.

According to Prof. Ritchie, these rudiments are only intelligible "on the theory that they are vestiges of structures which were of use in ancestors." The absurdity of this explanation is evident for it

X-BL26 E8

EVOLUTION NOT A TRUE SCIENCE

BY

W. A. Douglas Cole

A Series of Eight Articles Written to the "North Auckland Times," Dargaville, N.Z., by "Student."

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

PRICE—3D. EACH OR 2/6 PER DOZEN—EACH POST FREE

Obtainable from—
W. E. Filmer, 23 Dingwall Street, Croydon, Surrey, England; Dr. D. S. Milne, 47 Totara Crescent, Lower Hutt, New Zealand.

#77 X-BL263
.E8

EVOLUTION TODAY
(1948)

ALTHOUGH no one has succeeded in fooling all the people all time, Charles Darwin performed the great feat of fooling nea all the literate people in Europe and North America for 70 years that followed the appearance of *The Origin of Species*.

Darwin's influence, however, has been on the wane during the p eighteen or twenty years. Today in France, thanks largely to influence of that great zoologist, the late Louis Vialleton, probably m men of science reject the doctrine of evolution. In the rest of Eur and in North America the majority of scientists seem still to be evo tionists, but the size of this majority is rapidly dwindling, and indications are that before the close of the present decade evolutioni will have ceased to be fashionable. A generation is rising which is alrea critical.

Let us notice a few of the causes of this change of view.

The first is that biologists are awakening to the fact that the biologi sciences are no longer in step with the other sciences. The chief cre for this awakening is due to Dr. R. E. D. Clark, who is a physic On April 12th, 1943, he read before the Victoria Institute a pa entitled ' Evolution and Entropy ". He closed this paper with following words : " It seems reasonable to conclude, therefore, that in past ages complex organisms ever did evolve from simpler ones, process took place contrary to the laws of nature, and must ha involved what may rightly be termed the miraculous. For this rea the doctrine of evolution can never legitimately form a part of natura tic or sociological thought, nor can it ever be rightly used to supp such dogmas as the inevitability of progress."

Dr. Clark has followed up the above attack in his brilliant little bo entitled *Darwin : Before and After*, which was published in May, 19 Every adherent of the E.P.M. should read the book carefully ; its pr is only 6*s*.

The book begins with a masterly summary of the history of biologi science and sets forth the chief causes of the success achieved Darwinism, and contains much shrewd criticism of Darwin. It a shows that evolutionists have shirked the main issue at stake, viz. t " evolution is first and foremost a *chemical* problem " (p. 127). He ad " Living creatures are not built up out of heredity or natural selecti

#74 X-BL263
.E8

RECENT OPINIONS OF BIOLOGISTS ON EVOLUTION

(Second Edition)

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT
1948

X-BL262
OCT 20 1955

Evolution Protest Movement

5
Copy

INTERIM NEWS LETTER OF REMEMBRANCE : Captain Bernard Acworth, Douglas Dewar, and the E.P.M.

SANTHIA, STOKE, HAYLING ISLAND.

X-BL263

THE ORIGIN AND START OF THE MOVEMENT

It has been suggested by our Hon. Secretary, Mr. Tilney, that members of the Evolution Protest Movement, especially the younger ones now taking an increasingly active part in the extension of its influence, would be interested to know something of the circumstances that led to its inception, and subsequently to its foundation.

Nearly a quarter of a century has now passed, and most of those who launched the campaign, and prosecuted itin its earliest stages, are no longer here, one of the greatest of them all being Douglas Dewar to whom an inadequate tribute appears in this *News-Letter*.

I think I am right in saying that Dr. Basil Atkinson, the Under Librarian at Cambridge University, and I myself, are the only two living who were members of the original Council, and I have therefore undertaken to give some account of the inception, and launching, of the Society.

But here I must emphasise that I am writing of events long past, and of which I have few records ; furthermore round about the time of the founding of the Movement I was actively engaged in other spheres of service, and very particularly on Naval matters then exercising the public mind. I mention this in case I may, through faulty memory, have overlooked, or mis-stated, any relevant facts and, above all, left unrecorded the name of anyone who contributed to the successful launching of this organised campaign against the devastating fallacy of Darwinism.

In so far as I was responsible for the initiation of the E.P.M., the genesis of the idea occurred while crossing the Little Minch from Oban to fish for trout in South Uist, then a fisherman's peaceful paradise, but now shortly to become a paradise for rocketeers. While watching the wonderful convolutions of the gulls round and about the storm-tossed little ship, I suddenly realised, what naturalists from time immemorial had overlooked, namely, that birds and insects flying in winds, even of gale force, so far from feeling any wind pressure, were in reality flying in a dead calm, though in a moving one : that they were, in fact, aerial parasites when on the wing. On reflection, it became evident that herein lay the key to bird and insect migration, and other phenomena, and from that moment decided to make a careful study of books and writings of those who were, and still are, regarded universally as authorities in these subjects.

It was this study which first introduced me to the extraordinary fallacies into which the Theory of Evolution had led post-Darwinian naturalists and biologists through their surprising ignorance of the fundamental laws of dynamics which govern flight within a moving medium. The outcome of these studies was a series of articles in the *Spectator*, the *National Review*, and *Discovery*, which the scientific correspondent of the *Times*, in his weekly article, "The Progress of Science," reviewed at considerable length, and very favourably. These articles, in a modified form, were subsequently embodied in my first book, *This Bondage*, which was published by John Murray in 1929.

Evolution Protest Movement

Pamphlet : EVOLUTIONARY MAGIC OR CREATIVE MIRACLE ?

CREDIBILITY.

Our direct personal experience is so limited, that probably 99% of all our knowledge is taken on trust, by acts of faith. Very few people have ever seen an atom, let alone its internal structure, an H-bomb or its explosive effects ; very few have seen a chromosome in a living cell, or a gene producing its own peculiar effect in an organism. Of those who say they believe in Evolution as taking place, or as having taken place—how many have really seen this elusive but universally believed phenomenon ? The fact is, we all believe statements, that, though fitting neatly into our own peculiar scheme of things, seem quite incredible to other people—and we all refuse to accept as credible statements that other people find no difficulty in believing. The reason is not scientific and logical, but psychological and moral.

The Apostle Paul indeed asked the profligate King Herod Agrippa—who did consider the historical prophets of Israel credible—why he should think it incredible that God should raise the dead. Wishful thinking made the guilty monarch shrink from facing the fact of coming judgment.

Sir Julian Huxley's oft reiterated assertion that 'Evolution is a fact' means no more and no other than : (1) I (am willing to) believe it is a fact, or : (2) I would like it to be true. But—in view of the utter lack of positive evidence—Huxley's assertion is valueless ; it is but whistling in the dark. For Evolution has never been observed, nor proved to have taken place, i.e. Evolution in the sense of a self-starting and self-improving process, or the transformism of one kind of creature into another.

Further, since evolutionists (when not 'theistic') are avowed atheists, (e.g. communists), it follows that Evolution is actually magical, and irrational, as well as ungrateful. Deny the True Cause of Being and Providence, and you are left blind amid false clues, in addition to showing yourself as graceless a deceiver as a son, obviously kept by his father, whom he never acknowledges. For 'In Him we live, and move, and have our being.'

MAGIC.

What is 'magic' ? It is effects produced without competent cause, or without any cause at all. Read about in fairy tales, it is never met with in real life. Yet it is often referred to, under another name—LUCK. That is, something for nothing, a reward unworked for, mentally and physically. Faith always has a reason for believing ; it has 'every reason to believe.' But in an age of little or shallow faith, credulity—sand-built upon the persistent 'missing links' of logical credibility—resorts to magic. Without the red-light warning or winking admission that it is playful make-believe, the Creative Fiat ! is substituted by the illusionist's magic wand, and counterfeited by some Hey ! Presto ! or Open, Sesame ! Not in physics or chemistry, nor in laboratory biology, where the scientific method (of observation and experiment reinforced by repetition and verification) is in control, is magic invoked, for here the facts and factors and effects are shown and seen and reproduced—even if not fully understood. It is in the armchair of evolutionary philosophy, and in the textbook of copious but recondite and

.E8

SCIENCE AND PSEUDO-SCIENCE

by

LT.-COL. L. M. DAVIES
D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.E., F.G.S.

Reprinted by kind permission of the Proprietors, from "The Nineteenth Century and After," vol. CXLI, February, 1947, pages 108-112.

EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

W. H. HOULDERSHAW, LTD., PRINTERS, 49-55, LONDON ROAD, SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.

Copy ____ 1961
8
L263

Evolution Protest Movement

amphlet : THE EVASIVENESS OF EVOLUTION.

Evolution is not only elusive—but evasive.

It is evasive alike in the vagueness of the terms it uses, evasive in its aunted dependence upon persistently elusive links and arguments, evasive ı its avoidance of public debate, evasive in its side-stepping authorities, vasive in its shift from science to science, evasive in its retreat from country) country as the cradle of mankind or the home of the 'ape-man.'

:VASIVE TERMS.

Science is a prestige name, and Evolution is allegedly associated with o many sciences, though in reality related to none, that the general public s bluffed into believing that Evolution is scientific—which it is not. For Science is observation and measurement; experiment, confirmation and prediction, but Evolution cannot be seen or measured, and it is not amenable o the experimentation which is the very essence of the scientific Method. Nor is Evolution able to make promises and fulfil them. It promises intermediate stages between different families—notably apes and men. These predictions—unlike those of astronomy and chemistry—have never been fulfilled.

Evolution is not Science; it is philosophy—but, being illogical, it is bad philosophy. For the logic of Evolution is the queer 'logic of possibility,' whereby one possibility added to another possibility makes a probability which the addition of a third possibility makes a certainty. Thus it is like the fable of the milkmaid who would buy eggs which, when hatched, would purchase a pig; this, when its litter was grown, would provide her with a dowry. The thought of getting happily married so soon and so surely, made the lass jump for joy—but down came the milk—and away ran the eggs, chicks, hens, pig, piglets and all.

Charles Darwin was himself a notorious and self-confessed 'WRIGGER,' in his abuse of language, illogic and inconsistency.

The very term 'Evolution' is the basic offender. And there are many species of Evolution: Micro-, macro-, explosive, creative, theistic, Evolution; they range from implicit creation—substitute to explicit creative method. In common is the idea of change—whether slight or total, slow or sudden. Observed changes are small, and, if artificial and forced (like those induced by radiation on the fruit-flies in the laboratory), they are regularly harmful. But the fact that slight changes take place is enough for the poor logicians of Evolution to assume and assert that big, indeed total, changes have taken place—over infinite Time which, however, they cannot prove has ever existed. Darwin never proved the origin of variations, let alone the origin of species, which some biologists call a mere 'sphere of variation.' The 'arrival' of the fittest has not yet been explained, let alone the 'survival' of the fittest—which merely means the fittest to survive. As for 'Natural Selection' selecting the fittest, by the cuckoo-device of eject-

X-BL263
.E8
OCT 2 0 19

PARTICULARS
OF THE
Evolution Protest Movement
(SCRIPTURAL AND SCIENTIFIC)

Founded 1932

5
Copy

CONSTITUTION, AIMS, PUBLICATIONS

Past Presidents :

SIR AMBROSE FLEMING, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., 1932—1941.
SIR CHARLES MARSTON, F.S.A., 1941—1946.
DOUGLAS DEWAR, B.A. (Cantab.), F.Z.S., Barrister-at-Law, 1946—1957.

COUNCIL:

Founder and President: CAPTAIN BERNARD ACWORTH, D.S.O., R.N.

Chairman: C. E. A. TURNER, M.Sc., Ph.D

E. H. BETTS, B.Sc.
R. A. PORTER, M.A., M.B., B.Ch., B.A.
W. H. TIER
DAVID TILNEY, B.Sc.
M. W. TONGE, B.A.

Hon. Secretary and *Treasurer*: A. G. TILNEY, B.A.

Aims :

1. To publish and distribute pamphlets and books demonstrating that the **Theory** of Organic Evolution is **untrue.**
2. To **expose the methods** by which people have been led to believe that the Theory of Evolution has been proved to be true.
3. To show that the present standard of **morality** is due to a decline in true Christianity, and that this has been largely caused by the **under mining of faith** in the Bible by Evolutionary teaching.
4. To secure that **Biology** be taught in universities, schools, and on the radio **as a science,** instead of in the form of Evolutionary propaganda as hitherto.
5. To supply scientific data and information supporting the **Bible statements on Creation** as opposed to the widely accepted fantasies of Evolution.

Branch Secretaries and Distributors :

In accordance with the above aims the following pamphlets and books, covering every aspect of the subject, are obtainable from the Secretaries of the Movement :

A. G. TILNEY, *Santhia*, Stoke, Hayling Island, Hants., ENGLAND.

J. BYRT, B.SC., *Elpis*, Wilson Street, Cheltenham, S.22, Victoria, AUSTRALIA.

DAVID EDWARDS, *Rosehaven*, 404 Alexandra Street, Hastings, NEW ZEALAND.

Special prices can be arranged for quantities of 100 or more of som pamphlets. Please write for particulars.

Members pay minimum of 5/- ($1 in U.S.A.) per annum, and receive half-yearly News Letters, Pamphlets and Book Reviews. **Will you please join our ranks ?**

DEVOLUTION

By

DOUGLAS DEWAR

Reprinted by kind permission of Messrs. Constable and Co. Ltd., from the issue of "The Nineteenth Century and After" *of July*, 1946.

Obtainable at 4d., or 2s. 6d. per doz., post free, from W. E. Filmer, 78 North End, Croydon, Surrey.

THE EVOLUTION PROTEST MOVEMENT

X-BL263
.E8

Reasons Why Biologists Refuse to Debate Evolution

THE Royal Societies of London and Edinburgh and the Geological and Zoological Societies of London, and Professor D. M. S. Watson and Dr. Julian Huxley adopted a wise policy in flatly declining to debate in writing the subject of organic evolution with Lt.-Colonel L. M. Davies and Mr. Douglas Dewar, for the following reasons:

First, to most Biologists evolution has become a religion, a doctrine, accepted on faith, which it is not easy to defend.

Secondly, as the great majority of educated and half-educated people, including those who control the Press and the B.B.C., and those who occupy Modernist pulpits, believe evolution to be a law of nature, the adherents of the doctrine have nothing to gain by a debate on the subject.

Thirdly, there are a number of serious, even fatal, objections to the theory of organic evolution, of which the public is unaware, but which can be briefly stated and which certainly would be stated in a debate on the subject.

Here are a few of these objections:

1. Men of science, with all their knowledge and scientific apparatus, have not succeeded in changing non-living substances into living matter. Yet the theory of evolution supposes that blind unintelligent forces of nature have succeeded in accomplishing what intelligent and learned men cannot do. Nor is this all; these forces are supposed to have endued the living matter they produced with intelligence—an attribute they themselves lack!

2. The theory of organic evolution has failed to stand the test of experiment. The theory supposes that nature is in a state of flux, that species of animals and plants are changing into new species. But practical breeders and geneticists have failed to change any kind of plant or animal into a different kind. Experiment has demonstrated the great stability of species. Breeders have produced many breeds, but no new species. Centuries of breeding have resulted

X-BL263
.E8

Reprinted from Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, Vol. LXXX.

THE EARLIEST KNOWN ANIMALS.

By Douglas Dewar, B.A., F.Z.S.

THE most striking feature of the geological record is the abundance of fossils in the rocks laid down during the Cambrian and all later periods and the complete lack of *indubitable* fossils in all the earlier rocks—all those laid down in the pre-Cambrian period. Yet in many places these pre-Cambrian rocks seem to be well-fitted to hold and preserve fossils. Examples of such are the Torridon Sandstones of Scotland, 8,000 feet thick, the Green Shales of Brittany, 17,000 feet thick, the Huronian Series of Canada, 18,000 feet thick, the Tindir Group in Alaska, 20,000 feet thick, the Belt Series of North America, 40,000 feet thick, and the Cuddapah Series of India, 20,000 feet thick.

This sudden appearance of fossils in great variety and of high specialisation presented no difficulty to the older geologists, who regarded this as proof of a great creation at the beginning of the Cambrian period. But to the geologists who were induced by Darwin to accept the evolution theory this sudden advent in the rocks of a vast array of fossils presented a most formidable difficulty, because, in the words of Darwin (*Origin of Species*, 6th edn. (1882), p. 286) "if the theory be true, it is indisputable that before the lowest Cambrian stratum was deposited, long periods elapsed, as long as, or probably far longer than, the whole interval from the Cambrian age to the present day, and that during these vast periods the world swarmed with living creatures."

Darwin admitted the seriousness of this difficulty, because (p. 287), "it does not seem probable that the most ancient beds have been quite worn away by denudation, or that the fossils have been wholly obliterated by metamorphic action." He, however, took comfort because "only a small portion of the world is known with accuracy."

He was confident that further geological exploration would bring to light a copious pre-Cambrian fauna. In full confidence that such organisms existed in their millions in the pre-Cambrian

X-BL263
.E8

A CHALLENGE TO EVOLUTIONISTS

X-BL263
.E8

IS EVOLUTION A MYTH?

A Debate between

DOUGLAS DEWAR
B.A., F.Z.S.

L. MERSON DAVIES
D.Sc., Ph.D., F.G.S.

and

Prof. J. B. S. HALDANE
F.R.S.